



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

complication of denominational loyalty with political elections. There is evident concern about the Sandemanian heresy and it is clear that even at the end of the colonial period Congregationalism was still an experiment. In Connecticut it was in unstable equilibrium. The tendency to actual schism on theological grounds, Old Light or New Light, prepares us for the final division of Orthodox and Unitarian engendered in Massachusetts by a man from Connecticut, and the strength of the earlier movement in Connecticut to unite Congregationalists and Presbyterians explains why Jedediah Morse coquettishly with this project as soon as he settled in Massachusetts. In 1766 there is actual danger in Connecticut of coalition with Presbyterianism or with Episcopacy (p. 45¹). The ultra-Calvinism of the New Light party was driving people to the milder haven of Episcopalian churches. Even Charles Chauncy, doughty foe of Episcopacy, writes that New Light divinity is as bad as paganism and that he would rather be an Episcopalian than a Hopkinsian.

Education, too, is a theme, both Yale and Harvard being in view, while the letters which close the volume are of value in connection with the history of Princeton and the University of Pennsylvania. The letters are naturally more interesting than the miscellaneous jottings, especially a letter by Joseph Meigs describing the Bermudas.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

The Life of John Marshall. By ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE. Volumes I. and II. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1916. Pp. xxvi, 506; xviii, 620.)

It is a hundred years since John Marshall reached the summit of his career, and for many years he has been accepted as one of the first men of his day. Yet through all this period we have had no adequate account of his deeds or his personality. That part of his life which came before his appointment to the Supreme Bench was chiefly devoted to the practice of law. He served during this period only about four years in prominent station. He took a leading part in the debate on the adoption of the Constitution by the Virginia convention, but lapsed into private life immediately afterwards. He began to attract notice by his defense of the administration in regard to the Jay Treaty and then took position as the leading Federalist in his state. He was sent to France as a commissioner in the X Y Z affair and was elected to Congress in 1798. He made himself disliked by the Essex Junto and their friends in the Federalist party because he opposed the Sedition Law and refused to assail John Adams; but he took a strong position among the moderate Federalists. He was taken into Adams's Cabinet in May, 1800, and was made Chief Justice a month before his superior gave up office. This was a small amount of meat for a biographer.

Small as it is, Mr. Beveridge has made it serve for two large volumes.

The first, with the subtitle *Frontiersman, Soldier, Lawmaker*, takes the story from 1755 to 1788; the second, *Politician, Diplomatist, Statesman*, takes it to Marshall's appointment to the Supreme Court Bench, 1801. It is not possible to secure this large treatment without introducing much matter that is not strictly upon the subject. The author is conscious of the fact, and justifies himself on the ground that he is writing for persons who are not well informed in the history of the times. "To say that Marshall took this or that position with reference to the events and questions of his time, without some explanation of them, means little to anyone except to the historical scholar." And the preface goes on to say that to know Marshall we must know much about the men with whom he came into contact, "His life finally became so interlaced with that of Jefferson", we read, "that a faithful account of the one requires a careful examination of the other." These are good words if not taken too literally. The "reading public", using Mr. Beveridge's own term—and it is for that part of the people that he writes—needs to have things made plain. Probably he has made them so plain that they are diffuse. For example, the discussion of Marshall's part in the adoption of the federal Constitution, naturally brings up the general attitude of the people toward union, and that brings up the difficulties of communication, whereupon Mr. Beveridge introduces a chapter, thirty-eight pages, on Community Isolation. In a similar manner twenty-four pages are given to the army at Valley Forge and only four of them refer to Marshall, then a "captain-lieutenant". On the same principle we may justly expect that in the succeeding volumes *Fletcher v. Peck* will be preceded by a history of the Yazoo Company, which may demand a discussion of society in Georgia, and that *McCulloch v. Maryland* will be introduced by a history of the Bank of the United States, together with a discussion of the functions of a bank in society, which may necessitate another discussion of the functions and history of state banks. All this will be very interesting, and Mr. Beveridge will doubtless do it well, as he has done the discursive chapters in the two volumes before me, but is not all this going far afield for a man who announces his book as a *Life of Marshall*?

Although the book is not for historians, but only for the "reading public", the historians will not disdain to use it. They will find much to commend in the industry with which the published materials have been sought out and used. Although little that is new has been found, we are left with the impression that a careful search has been made. The foot-notes are abundant and very informing. The bibliographies are good, although we must wonder why the *Life of Marshall* by Magruder is not mentioned in either volume. At least one draft of the book has been read by twelve distinguished scholars, including two presidents of the American Historical Association and at least one who is going to be a president, which shows with what care the author has sought to eliminate grounds for criticism. His pages are unusually free

from those small slips which mar many otherwise good books; but the name of Stevens Thomson Mason, stumbling-block to many a printer, appears as "Stephen H. Mason" in one place (II. 115), as "Stephen Thompson Mason" in another (II. 151, note 2), and as "Stephen T. Mason" in the index. Many a good author has had trouble with this unusual name.

Probably the best parts of the book are those which deal with the debate in the Virginia convention for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and those that refer to the X Y Z affair. The contest over adoption is presented by a man who knows how forensic battles are fought and who has a remarkable power of visualization. The reader is shown the strategy on each side. It is a fine feature of the story that Marshall is not the dominating personage on the Federalist side: he is only one of several great debaters taking his place in a procedure which more astute persons are directing. In the four chapters on the mission to France, 160 pages, we have the clearest and most satisfactory story that has been told of that interesting incident. I do not think, however, that the author has been equally successful in discussing the events which followed, and this is particularly true in regard to the rivalry which then sprang up between John Adams and the extreme Federalists, leading to the disruption of the Cabinet and the conclusion of a new treaty with France. Mr. Beveridge does not escape from the ancient Federalist leaning, though he evidently tries to escape. He speaks of the resistance of American ships against the outrages of the French navy as a war against France, an inaccuracy into which enthusiasm for our fighting ability has led many other writers.

Probably his best service is that he has given us a picture of a very human man. It is pleasant to know that Marshall was jovial and witty, that he laughed at the complaints of his fellow-sufferers at Valley Forge, that he excelled them in sports and equalled them in bravery, that in spite of his slovenly appearance he was the delight of women and of men, and that in any assembly of politicians he won more votes by his jovial personal manner than others won by their arguments. Even when he was fighting to the utmost to circumvent Patrick Henry in the debate on adoption of the Constitution, the two men were on the best terms personally. In fact, the older man loved the younger so greatly that when Marshall was running for Congress in 1798 and was in imminent danger of defeat, Henry came to his rescue in an earnest letter which probably turned the scales in the election. The chief justice who could win and hold friends in this way was likely to dominate any bench over which he presided.

Excellent use is made of account-books kept by Marshall in his early life. The entries bear witness to his simple living and his adjustment to the life around him. He was not unlike other young Virginians of his day. Although connected with the leaders in government, he was poor, and his income from his profession the first year of his practice was

£9 9s. from four fees. His purse received added substance from his salary as member of assembly, a position he secured through the influence of his father. The account-books tell us that he purchased all sorts of things: wine, rum, a teapot, "edging", "2 pieces of bobbin", as well as sugar, stockings, corn, and candlesticks. Here we read, also, that he lost and won money at cards, in social games, no doubt. Now it was "whist 30/", and "poker 6/", again it was "backgammon 6£", and still again, "Col. Monroe and self at the play 1—10". At nearly one and the same time he paid his dues to the parson, his subscription to the races, and his share in the expenses of the ball.

Dramatic power is one of Mr. Beveridge's strong qualities and it is well displayed in this book. He has known how to make the reader see and remember the kind of man he has in mind. He is not free from some of the evils of the striking writer. He strives for effects, probably without realizing it; and he frequently heightens the light to strengthen his picture. He is not a balanced thinker, and he shows little appreciation for understatement, the finest flower of scientific history. He does not see the other side of Jeffersonian republicanism. He characterizes the discontent for which Shays spoke as "the mobs erupting from this crater of anarchy now located in New England" (I. 299), and he does not seem to realize the yearning of the small farmers of the Middle and Southern States for their part in government that underlay the organization of the Republican party. Either love of effects or indifference to good usage leads him to employ many inept phrases. We read, for example, that a certain date "is jammed in" (I. 179), that "Pinckney rode Gerry hard" (II. 328), that Bushrod Washington "had no more political acumen than a turtle" (II. 413), that "the President grasped by the forelock this possibility for peace" (II. 423). Even "the reading public" has a right to expect that the historian shall do his part in preserving the dignity and chasteness of the language we use. Nor can I think of any line of reasoning by which the expression "bi-yearly" (I. 200) is justified. If it springs from hostility to the classics, why not demolish the prefix also? Mr. Beveridge can dominate the reader without employing such phrases.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

With Americans of Past and Present Days. By J. J. JUSSERAND.
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1916. Pp. ix, 350.)

THE author of this book is an accomplished diplomat and scholar, and truly a representative of the French to the Americans. His sympathy with our history and especially with the alliance between France and the United States which won the Revolution has found expression in a book which must increase the friendly feeling between the two nations. For thirteen years, as he tells us in his preface, he has been the French ambassador at Washington, a longer service than any of his predecessors had, and during that time he has delivered several